

REMARKS

The following Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed July 25, 2008. Claims 1-3 are under examination in the present application. Applicants appreciate Examiner's careful review of the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now placed in condition for allowance. Detailed reasons for allowance are as follows:

Response to Arguments

On page 5 of the Office action, it is indicated that the term "field", in computer science, can reasonably be defined as "a set of one or more adjacent characters comprising a unit of information", and a keyword in a document is simply a set of one or more adjacent characters, the one or more adjacent characters together comprise a unit of information (a collection of characters here can be a word). In this regard, the Examiner asserts that the "field" is equivalent to the "keyword", and further asserts that the presently claimed feature of "**an identified field of the structured information report**" has been taught in the cited reference Seibel (the Examiner refers to paragraph [0019], lines 8-12 and paragraph [0074], lines 6-9 and paragraph [0049], lines 12-13). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse as follows:

In one aspect, Applicants submit that "field", in computer science, could be defined as "an element of a database record in which one piece of information is stored". That is, "field" relates to an area that is used for storing one piece of information such as one or more numbers or words. The definition of "field" is supported by paragraph [0031] of the present application. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the presently claimed feature of "**an identified field of the structured information report**" is quite different from the "keyword" of Seibel.

In another aspect, Applicants acknowledge that different types of electronic data stored in a computer such as a graphic, a word, or a symbol, can be generally defined as “a set of one or more adjacent characters, which together, comprise a unit of information”. However, the different types of electronic data are different subject matter, and each of the different types of electronic data has a different usage. Although, the Examiner asserted that “field” and “keyword” have a same general definition, Applicants submit that the presently claimed feature of **“an identified field of the structured information report”** is quite different from the “keyword” of Seibel.

Particularly, Applicants submit that the usage of an **“identified field”** in the present invention is for storing all information (such as one or more numbers/words) that have been or will be stored in the **“identified field”**, and is different from the usage of the “keyword” in Seibel. Thus, the execution of **“marking an identified field of the structured information report”** that forms a marked field so as to highlight all information that have been or will be stored in the marked field, which is quite different from the execution of “marking a key phase or a keyword”. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the execution of **“marking an identified field of the structured information report”** distinguishes the present invention from Seibel.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by John C. Seibel et al. (US 2006/0004731, hereinafter “Seibel”).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Seibel. The following remarks herein are responsive to the rejections as understood.

Claims 1-3

Claim 1 recites in part:

“a marking sub-module for marking an identified field of the structured information report with a designated mark to form a marked field.”

Applicants submit that Seibel does not disclose, teach or suggest the invention having the above-highlighted feature as set forth in claim 1.

Seibel discloses that a system 10 implements an automated process of vertical industry intelligence building that involves automated reverse lookup of contact information using an email address and key phrase highlighting based on business rules and a search criteria (paragraph [0019], lines 8-12). Keywords will be highlighted or otherwise pointed to, in order to facilitate rapid location of relevant areas of a text when a document is located through a keyword search (paragraph [0074], lines 6-9).

According to these disclosures of Seibel, a key phrase or a keyword can be highlighted based on a search criteria, and a keyword can be highlighted to rapidly locate relevant areas of a text. However, the claimed feature of **“an identified field of the structured information report”** is not disclosed or taught by Seibel. As claimed in claim 1, the feature of **“an identified field”** relates to an area where one or more words or numbers can be stored. Such a feature is supported by paragraph [0031] of the present application, as originally filed, and is not mentioned at all in Seibel. That is, the presently claimed feature of **“an identified field”** is apparently different from *a key phrase or a keyword* disclosed by Seibel. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Seibel fails to disclose or teach the feature of **“a marking sub-module for marking an identified field of the structured information report with a designated mark to form a marked field,”** as recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants state that the system for visually mining information of the present invention is distinctly and patentably different from the system and/or method disclosed by Seibel.

Appl. No. 10/749,311
Amdt. Dated August 18, 2008
Reply to Office Action Mailed July 25, 2008

In conclusion, Applicants submit that Seibel does not disclose, teach, or suggest the present invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in claim 1. That is, claim 1 is not only novel under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Seibel, but also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Seibel. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of claim 1 are requested.

Claims 2-3 depend from independent claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Thus claims 2-3 should also now be allowable

Appl. No. 10/749,311
Amdt. Dated August 18, 2008
Reply to Office Action Mailed July 25, 2008

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the foregoing Response places this application in condition for allowance. If Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 714.626.1224.

Respectfully,

Lee et al.

By /Frank R. Niranjan/ Date: August 18, 2008

Frank R. Niranjan

Registration No.: 41,572

Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (714) 626-1224

Fax No.: (714) 738-4649